

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 326

JC 700 229

AUTHOR Riess, Louis C.
TITLE Summary of a Study Which Examines the Current and Recommended Degrees of Faculty Participation in Decision-Making in California Community Colleges as Perceived by Both Faculty and Administrators.
PUB DATE Nov 70
NOTE 18p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.00
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy, Administrative Principles, *Decision Making, *Educational Administration, Expectation, *Junior Colleges, *Participation, *Role Perception, Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

An insight into the degree of California junior college faculty participation in decision-making was provided by obtaining the perceptions of state junior college faculty members and administrators. Each individual responded to a questionnaire containing 23 decision-making items by numerically indicating relative differences between current and recommended levels of participation. Of the personnel contacted at 81 state-wide colleges, returns were received from 111 (68.9 per cent) of the administrators and 171 (60.6 per cent) of the faculty. A comparison of group responses suggests the following conclusions: (1) both groups support greater faculty participation in community college decision-making on all items, though the faculty see greater differences between existing and requisite levels; (2) the faculty senate is seen by a majority in both groups as the vehicle for the most significant increases; and (3) the principles of participative management should characterize the decision-making process. (J0)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SUMMARY OF A STUDY WHICH EXAMINES THE CURRENT
AND RECOMMENDED DEGREES OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING
IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
AS PERCEIVED BY BOTH FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS

by

Dr. Louis C. Riess

Assistant to the President

Pasadena City College

November 1970

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 06 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

ED043326

JC 700 229

ABSTRACT OF THE STUDY

THE PROBLEM:

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree and nature of current faculty participation in decision-making in California Community Colleges, and to determine in the judgment of faculty members and administrators the degree to which faculty members should participate.

PROCEDURE:

A random sampling of the staff of 81 community colleges during the fall of 1969 resulted in completed questionnaires from 111 (68.9%) administrators and 171 (60.6%) faculty members. The respondents were asked to indicate the current and recommended degrees of faculty participation for each of twenty-three decision-making items, utilizing five responses with the relative weights of 1 to 5. Twelve sets of comparisons were made for each of the twenty-three decision-making items. The mean and standard deviation were computed for each of the twenty-three items in each set of comparisons. The F test was applied to each comparison and the difference was considered to be significant if it was at or beyond the five percent level of confidence. The mean scores were also placed in rank order with the highest mean ranked number one.

MAJOR FINDINGS:

1. The faculty indicated a significant difference for all twenty-three items when current and recommended degrees of faculty participation in decision-making were compared. The administrators indicated a significant difference for twenty. Both the faculty and administrators recommend greater faculty participation for all items.

2. When comparing faculty with administrators regarding current participation, the faculty perceived less faculty participation than the administrators for all twenty-three items, with a significant difference for twenty-two.

3. When comparing faculty with administrators regarding recommended participation, the faculty indicated a higher degree of faculty participation for all twenty-three items, with fifteen of the items significantly different.

4. The only significant difference in the comparisons of faculty sub-groups occurred between academic and applied faculty regarding recommended participation. The academic faculty indicated a higher degree of faculty participation for all twenty-three items, with thirteen significantly different.

5. The academic senate was selected by 138 (80.7%) of the faculty, and 99 (89.9%) of the administrators over the negotiating council and collective bargaining as the most effective method of faculty participation in community college governance.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The faculty and administrators support a broad and significant increase in faculty participation in community college decision-making, with the differences being matter of degree, not direction.

2. The faculty and administrators suggest that the academic senate is the most appropriate and effective model to provide for a significant increase in faculty participation in community college decision-making.

3. Community colleges should develop an administrative process based on the principles of participative management.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Community College Trustees, faculty and administrators should work actively to strengthen both the local and state-wide academic senates.

2. The president with trustee support should establish a college recommending body which is chaired by the president and made up of representatives from the faculty, administration, students and classified staff to receive and act upon tentative policy recommendations received from any of these component groups.

3. The president should establish a joint faculty, administrator, student and classified staff college-wide committee system which would articulate both with these component groups as well as with the college policy-recommending body.

4. Trustees, administration and faculty should continue to work actively for the removal of community colleges from under jurisdiction of the Winton Act.

SUMMARY OF THE STATISTICAL FINDINGS

Tables A and B provide a composite of both faculty and administrator responses. Table A makes a comparison of current and recommended participation as perceived by all respondents, and Table B indicates the frequency distributions and percentages of the raw data used for the comparisons made in Table A.

Although the data presented in Tables A and B are different from the twenty-four tables developed in the actual study, the following statistical generalities may be drawn.

1. The mean scores for the faculty respondents regarding current faculty participation were lower than those listed for all respondents under current participation in Table A for all items, whereas the mean scores for administrators were higher for all items.

2. The mean scores for the faculty respondents regarding recommended faculty participation were higher than those listed for all respondents under recommended participation in Table A for all items, whereas the mean

scores for administrators were lower for all items.

3. The mean scores for the following faculty sub-groups will be lower than those listed for all respondents in Table A for current participation, but higher than those listed for all respondents for recommended faculty participation: males, females, tenured teachers with 4 to 15 years teaching experience, tenured teachers with over 15 years' teaching experience, teachers with experience in faculty senates, faculty associations and negotiating councils, and teachers with no experience in these campus organizations.

4. The mean scores for academic and applied faculty varied. The mean scores for both groups were generally the same for current participation as those listed in #3 above, but different for recommended participation when compared to scores for all respondents in Table A. The mean scores for academic faculty respondents regarding recommended faculty participation were higher than those listed for all respondents in Table A for all items, whereas the mean scores for applied faculty were lower than those listed for all respondents in Table A for eighteen of the twenty-three items.

5. The frequency distributions followed the same general pattern as the mean scores. The faculty distributions shifted towards the right (towards None) when compared to those of all respondents in Table B regarding current participation and shifted towards the left (towards Determination) when compared to those of all respondents in Table B regarding recommended participation. The administrator responses were just the opposite, this distribution shifting towards the left for current participation and towards the right for recommended participation.

Tables C and D provide a comprehensive comparison of the mean score and ranking for each decision-making item for all of the groups surveyed in the study. The mean for each item was determined by averaging the weighted

scores for each group compared. These data were similar to those listed in Table B, with the weights ranging from 1 for NONE to 5 for DETERMINATION.

Table C lists the scores for the current degree of faculty participation and Table D lists the scores for the recommended degree of faculty participation. These Tables provide the reader with the following types of comparisons.

1. Horizontal scanning of the data on each Table indicates the comparative ranking for each group of respondents for each item.

2. Vertical scanning of the data on each Table indicates the comparative rank of each item for the same group of respondents.

3. Comparison of Tables C and D indicates the difference between the current and recommended degrees participation for each item between any of the listed groups.

The following is a summary of the twelve sets of comparisons which were made in the study, indicating those items which were significantly different at, or beyond, the five percent level of confidence.

1. Comparison of Faculty Responses Regarding Current and Recommended Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The faculty recommended a significantly greater degree of participation for all 23 items.

2. Comparison of Administrator Responses Regarding Current and Recommended Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The administrators recommended a greater degree of participation for all 23 items, with the degree significant for all but items 5, 6 and 21.

3. Comparison of Faculty-Administrator Responses Regarding Current Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The administrators perceived a greater degree of current participation than the faculty for all 23 items, with the degree significant for all items except item 19.

4. Comparison of Faculty and Administrator Responses Regarding Recommended Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The faculty recommended a greater degree of participation than the administrators for all 23 items, with the degree significant for all but items 3, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 17 and 21.

5. Comparison of Male and Female Faculty Responses Regarding Current Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The males perceived a greater degree of current participation than females for 16 of the items, with none of the 23 items significantly different.

6. Comparison of Male and Female Faculty Responses Regarding Recommended Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The females recommended a greater degree of participation than the males for 13 of the items, with only item 18 significantly different.

7. Comparison of Experienced and Non-Experienced Faculty Responses Regarding Current Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The faculty members with experience in campus organizations such as the academic senate perceived a greater degree of current participation than the faculty without this type of experience for 17 of the items, with only items 7 and 21 significantly different.

8. Comparison of Experienced and Non-Experienced Faculty Responses Regarding Recommended Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The faculty members without experience in campus organizations such as the academic senate recommended a greater degree of participation than the experienced faculty for 17 of the items, with none of the 23 items significantly different.

9. Comparison of Responses of Tenured Faculty (4 to 15 years experience) and Tenured Faculty (over 15 years experience) Regarding Current Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The over 15 year tenured faculty group perceived a greater degree of current participation than the 4 to 15 year group for 12 of the items with only item 14 significantly different.

10. Comparison of Responses of Tenured Faculty (4 to 15 years experience) and Tenured Faculty (over 15 years experience) Regarding Recommended Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The over 15 year tenured faculty group recommended a greater degree of participation than the 4 to 15 year group for 16 of the items, with only items 11 and 13 significantly different.

11. Comparison of Academic and Applied Faculty Responses Regarding Current Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The academic faculty perceived a greater degree of current participation than the applied faculty for 16 of the items, with only items 11, 19, 20, 21, and 22 significantly different.

12. Comparison of Academic and Applied Faculty Responses Regarding Recommended Participation of Faculty Members in College Decision-Making.

The academic faculty recommended a greater degree of participation than the applied faculty for all 23 items, with items 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 significantly different.

TABLE A

COMPARISON OF ALL RESPONSES REGARDING CURRENT AND RECOMMENDED PARTICIPATION
OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DECISION-MAKING

DECISION-MAKING ITEMS	Current Participation (N=282)			Recommended Participation (N=282)			F RATIO
	MEAN	STD DEV	RANK	MEAN	STD DEV	RANK	
1. Selection of new faculty members (Hiring of new teachers)	2.93	1.05	11	3.60	0.82	12	143.2 *
2. Evaluation and reten- tion of probationary teachers (Granting tenure)	2.51	1.13	16	3.39	0.90	16	200.2 *
3. Evaluation of permanent faculty	1.99	1.19	20	3.25	1.09	21	282.9 *
4. Dismissal of tenured faculty	1.93	1.11	21	3.27	1.06	18	307.3 *
5. Curriculum offerings and course requirements	3.69	0.80	1	4.00	0.59	2	43.96 *
6. Student degree require- ments	3.27	1.04	4	3.80	0.72	7	89.30 *
7. Student admission, re- tention (probation) and dismissal standards	2.90	1.14	12	3.59	0.83	13	137.1 *
8. Institutional research policy relating to eval- uation of instruction	2.62	1.20	15	3.62	0.81	11	190.4 *
9. Selection of the super- intendent, president, and vice-president	2.09	1.16	19	3.27	0.95	19	274.8 *
10. Selection of academic deans and division heads	2.32	1.15	17	3.38	0.91	17	212.2 *
11. Selection of department chairman	3.05	1.36	8	3.91	0.96	4	137.5 *
12. Selection of staff per- sonnel (business mana- gers, director of re- search, personnel, etc.)	1.70	1.00	23	2.84	1.08	23	272.9 *

COMPARISON OF ALL RESPONSES REGARDING CURRENT AND RECOMMENDED PARTICIPATION
OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DECISION-MAKING

DECISION-MAKING ITEMS	Current Participation (N=282)			Recommended Participation (N=282)			F RATIO
	MEAN	STD DEV	RANK	MEAN	STD DEV	RANK	
13. Development of faculty compensation guidelines	3.14	0.98	6.5	3.83	0.63	5	140.1 *
14. Development of administration compensation guidelines	1.83	1.08	22	3.16	1.06	22	319.6 *
15. Allocations for secretaries, related equipment and supplies	2.16	1.10	18	3.26	0.96	20	269.6 *
16. Budget planning and allocation of institutional resources	2.94	0.94	9.5	3.64	0.68	10	137.8 *
17. Departmental and institutional facilities planning	2.62	1.00	14	3.52	0.73	15	193.4 *
18. Teaching load and class size	2.78	0.93	13	3.71	0.72	8.5	191.8 *
19. Teacher class and room assignments	2.94	1.07	9.5	3.58	0.87	14	115.3 *
20. Specify organization, duties and authority of department committees	3.29	1.36	3	3.93	0.96	3	90.44 *
21. Membership of department committees	3.63	1.41	2	4.11	0.98	1	56.85 *
22. Specify organization, duties and a authority of college wide committees	3.14	1.14	6.5	3.71	0.81	8.5	99.60 *
24. Membership of college wide committees	3.23	1.19	5	3.81	0.85	6	91.01 *

*Indicates that the "F" ratio is significant at or beyond the (five percent) level of confidence.

TABLE B

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES FOR ALL RESPONDENTS REGARDING
CURRENT AND RECOMMENDED PARTICIPATION OF FACULTY IN
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DECISION-MAKING

DECISION-MAKING ITEMS	DIST	Current Participation (N=282)					Recommended Participation (N=282)				
		DET	JA	CON	DIS	NO	DET	JA	CON	DIS	NO
1. Selection of new faculty members (Hiring of new teachers)	Freq	6	92	95	53	36	21	158	79	16	8
	%	2	33	34	19	13	7	56	28	6	3
2. Evaluation and reten- tion of probationary teachers (Granting tenure)	Freq	6	55	87	64	70	12	142	86	29	13
	%	2	20	31	23	25	4	50	31	10	5
3. Evaluation of permanent faculty	Freq	5	42	42	50	143	20	123	75	36	28
	%	2	15	15	18	51	7	44	27	13	10
4. Dismissal of tenured faculty	Freq	2	35	48	54	143	18	127	77	34	26
	%	1	12	17	19	51	6	45	27	12	9
5. Curriculum offerings and course requirements	Freq	26	170	66	13	7	38	213	26	2	3
	%	9	60	23	5	3	14	76	9	1	1
6. Student degree require- ments	Freq	15	133	71	40	23	26	191	52	8	5
	%	5	47	25	14	8	9	68	18	3	2
7. Student admission, re- tention (probation) and dismissal standards	Freq	11	96	70	63	42	17	169	68	19	9
	%	4	34	25	22	15	6	60	24	7	3
8. Institutional research policy relating to eval- uation of instruction	Freq	4	84	67	55	72	14	184	57	18	9
	%	1	30	24	20	26	5	66	20	6	3
9. Selection of the super- intendent, president, and vice-president	Freq	3	37	73	37	132	9	126	102	22	23
	%	1	13	26	13	47	3	45	36	8	8
10. Selection of academic deans and division heads	Freq	4	51	69	65	93	14	133	94	27	14
	%	1	18	25	23	33	5	47	33	10	5
11. Selection of departmen- tal chairman	Freq	51	62	68	51	50	84	117	60	14	7
	%	18	22	24	18	18	30	42	21	5	3
12. Selection of staff per- sonnel (business mana- ger, director of re- search, personnel), etc.	Freq	2	21	37	52	170	7	81	98	53	43
	%	7	7	13	18	60	3	29	35	19	15

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES FOR ALL RESPONDENTS REGARDING
CURRENT AND RECOMMENDED PARTICIPATION OF FACULTY IN
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DECISION-MAKING**

DECISION-MAKING ITEMS	DIST	Current Participation (N=282)					Recommended Participation (N=282)				
		DET	JA	CON	DIS	NO	DET	JA	CON	DIS	NO
13. Development of faculty compensation guidelines	Freq	10	105	101	45	21	18	211	42	8	3
	%	4	37	36	16	7	6	75	15	3	1
14. Development of administration compensation guidelines	Freq	2	29	43	52	156	4	141	65	40	32
	%	1	10	15	18	55	1	50	23	14	11
15. Allocations for secretaries, related equipment and supplies	Freq	5	36	58	84	99	12	123	91	39	17
	%	2	13	21	30	35	4	44	32	14	6
16. Budget planning and allocation of institutional resources	Freq	6	80	105	73	18	7	186	72	13	4
	%	2	28	37	26	6	3	66	26	5	1
17. Departmental and institutional facilities planning	Freq	4	53	100	83	42	6	162	91	18	5
	%	1	19	36	29	15	2	57	32	6	2
18. Teaching load and class size	Freq	1	71	98	88	24	21	176	69	13	3
	%	0	25	35	31	9	7	62	25	5	1
19. Teacher class and room assignments	Freq	16	76	94	67	29	30	139	85	21	7
	%	6	27	33	24	10	11	49	30	7	3
20. Specify organization, duties and authority of department committees	Freq	70	68	52	58	34	85	122	52	17	6
	%	25	24	18	21	12	30	43	18	6	2
21. Membership of department committees	Freq	115	51	43	43	30	124	88	54	10	6
	%	41	18	15	15	11	44	31	19	4	2
22. Specify organization, duties and authority of college wide committees	Freq	22	110	61	62	27	30	168	58	23	3
	%	8	39	22	22	10	11	60	21	8	1
23. Membership of college wide committees	Freq	39	96	65	55	27	51	153	56	18	4
	%	14	34	23	20	10	18	54	20	6	1

NOTE - DET - DETERMINATION
JA - JOINT ACTION
CON - CONSULTATION

FREQ - FREQUENCY
NO - NONE
DIST - DISTRIBUTION

TABLE C

The mean score and rank for each item, for all respondents, administrators, faculty and faculty sub-groups, regarding the current degree of faculty participation in decision-making.

DECISION-MAKING ITEMS	ALL RESPONDENTS	FACULTY		ADMINIS- TRATION		MALE FACULTY		FEMALE FACULTY		APPLIED FACULTY		ACADEMIC FACULTY		FACULTY WITH PROFESSIONAL- ORGANIZA- TIONAL EXPER-		FACULTY WITH OUT PROFES- SIONAL ORGA- NIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE		TENURED FA- CULTY 4 to 15 YEARS EXPR- IENCE		TENURED FA- CULTY WITH OVER 15 YEARS EXPERIENCE	
		MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK
1. Selection of new fa- culty members (Hiring of new teachers)	2.92 11	2.70 11	3.27 11	2.74 10	2.60 11	2.55 12	2.80 10	2.71 11.5	2.66 11	2.72 10	2.39 12	2.69 10	2.72 10	2.35 16	2.19 15	2.66 11	2.72 10	2.39 15.5	2.69 10	2.72 12	2.39 14
2. Evaluation and reten- tion of probationary teachers	2.51 16	2.33 15	2.79 17	2.40 16	2.17 16	2.00 17	2.42 14	2.37 15	2.19 16	2.35 15.5	2.39 14	2.42 14	2.37 15	2.19 15	2.35 16	2.19 15	2.35 16	2.39 15.5	2.39 14	2.39 14	2.39 14
3. Evaluation of permanent faculty	1.99 20	1.80 20	2.28 20	1.84 19	1.70 21	1.75 19	1.83 20	1.79 20	1.83 19.5	1.84 20	1.65 20.5	1.83 20	1.79 20	1.83 19.5	1.83 20	1.83 19.5	1.84 20	1.65 20	1.65 20.5	1.65 20.5	1.65 20.5
4. Dismissal of tenured faculty	1.93 21	1.74 21	2.21 21	1.71 21	1.82 19	1.65 20.5	1.81 21	1.72 21	1.83 19.5	1.77 21	1.65 20.5	1.81 21	1.72 21	1.83 19.5	1.83 20	1.83 19.5	1.77 21	1.65 20	1.65 20.5	1.65 20.5	1.65 20.5
5. Curriculum offerings and course requirements	3.69 1	3.57 1	3.86 2	3.56 1	3.60 1	3.64 1	3.53 2	3.61 1	3.44 1	3.57 1	3.64 1	3.53 2	3.61 1	3.44 1	3.57 1	3.44 1	3.57 1	3.56 1	3.56 2	3.56 2	3.56 2
6. Student degree require- ments	3.27 4	3.07 5	3.58 4	3.05 4	3.11 4	3.21 2	2.97 8.5	3.11 5	2.91 4	3.05 4	3.21 2	2.97 8.5	3.11 5	2.91 4	3.05 4	3.05 4	3.05 4	3.13 4	3.13 4	3.13 4	3.13 4
7. Student admission, re- tention and dismissal standards	2.89 12	2.62 12	3.32 9	2.65 12	2.52 12	2.64 9	2.60 12	2.72 10	2.22 14.5	2.54 12	2.64 9	2.60 12	2.72 10	2.22 14.5	2.54 12	2.54 12	2.54 12	2.78 12	2.78 11	2.78 11	2.78 11

TABLE C
CONTINUED

The mean score and rank for each item, for all respondents, administrators, faculty and faculty sub-groups, regarding the current degree of faculty participation in decision-making.

DECISION-MAKING ITEMS	ALL RESPONDENTS	FACULTY		ADMINIS- TRATION		MALE FACULTY		FEMALE FACULTY		APPLIED FACULTY		ACADEMIC FACULTY		FACULTY WITH PROFESSIONAL, ORGANIZA- TIONAL EXPER- IENCE		FACULTY WITH OUT PROFS- SIONAL ORGA- NIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE		TENURED FA- CULTY 4 to 15 YEARS EXPERIENCE		TENURED FA- CULTY WITH OVER 15 YEARS EXPER- IENCE	
		MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK
8. Institutional research policy relating to eval- uation of instruction	2.62 15	2.32	16	3.08	13	2.41	14.5	2.09	16	2.37	14.5	2.28	16	2.34	16	2.22	14.5	2.35	15.5	2.13	16
9. Selection of the super- intendent, president, and vice-president	2.08 19	1.84	19	2.45	19	1.79	20	1.96	17	1.65	20.5	1.97	18	1.88	19	1.66	22	1.89	19	1.86	19
10. Selection of academic deans and division heads	2.31 17	1.94	18	2.89	16	1.95	18	1.94	18	1.82	18	2.02	17	1.94	18	1.94	18	1.94	18	2.08	17
11. Selection of department chairman	3.04 8	2.83	9	3.37	7	2.88	9	2.70	8	2.51	13	3.04	6	2.77	9	3.05	2	2.82	9	3.08	7
12. Selection of staff per- sonnel (business mana- gers, director of re- search, personnel, etc.)	1.69 23	1.45	23	2.08	23	1.49	23	1.35	23	1.41	23	1.47	23	1.42	23	1.55	23	1.47	23	1.26	22
13. Development of faculty compensation guidelines	3.13 6.5	2.89	7	3.50	5	2.90	8	2.88	7	2.78	5.5	2.97	8.5	2.92	7	2.77	7.5	2.90	7	3.08	7
14. Development of adminis- tration compensation guidelines	1.82 22	1.61	22	2.15	22	1.58	22	1.68	22	1.60	22	1.62	22	1.57	22	1.75	21	1.67	22	1.21	23
15. Allocations for secre- taries, related equip- ment and supplies	2.16 18	1.96	17	2.46	18	2.04	17	1.78	20	2.10	16	1.87	19	1.95	17	2.00	17	1.97	17	1.95	18

TABLE C
CONTINUED

The mean score and rank for each item, for all respondents, administrators, faculty and faculty sub-groups, regarding the current degree of faculty participation in decision-making.

DECISION-MAKING ITEMS	ALL RESPONDENTS		FACULTY		ADMINIS- TRATION		MALE FACULTY		FEMALE FACULTY		APPLIED FACULTY		ACADEMIC FACULTY		FACULTY WITH PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZA- TIONAL EXPER- IENCE		FACULTY WITH OUT PROTES- SIONAL, ORGA- NIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE		TENURED FA- CULTY 4 to 15 YEARS EXPERIENCE		TENURED FA- CULTY WITH OVER 15 YEARS EXPERIENCE	
	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK
16. Budget planning and allocation of institutional resources	2.94	9.5	2.70	10	3.29	10	2.72	11	2.66	9	2.68	8	2.72	11	2.71	11.5	2.69	10	2.65	11	2.91	10
17. Departmental and institutional facilities planning	2.62	14	2.36	14	3.01	15	2.41	14.5	2.25	14	2.37	14.5	2.36	15	2.37	14	2.33	12	2.37	14	2.30	15
18. Teaching load and class size	2.77	13	2.52	13	3.17	12	2.54	13	2.47	13	2.60	11	2.46	13	2.58	13	2.27	13	2.53	13	2.65	13
19. Teacher class and room assignment	2.94	9.5	2.86	8	3.06	14	2.95	7	2.62	10	2.62	10	3.01	7	2.89	8	2.72	9	2.83	8	3.00	9
20. Specify organization, duties and authority of department committees	3.29	3	3.09	4	3.59	3	3.03	5	3.23	3	2.78	5.5	3.30	3	3.17	3.5	2.77	7.5	3.14	3	3.08	7
21. Membership of department committees	3.63	2	3.39	2	4.00	1	3.36	2	3.45	2	3.08	3	3.60	1	3.51	2	2.94	3	3.41	2	3.60	1
22. Specify organization, duties and authority of college wide committees	3.13	6.5	3.00	6	3.33	8	3.01	6	2.98	5	2.77	7	3.16	5	3.05	6	2.80	5.5	2.97	6	3.13	4.5
23. Membership of college wide committees	3.23	5	3.09	3	3.43	6	3.15	3	2.96	6	2.95	4	3.19	4	3.17	3.5	2.80	5.5	3.04	5	3.39	3

TABLE NO. D. The mean score and rank for each item, for all respondents, administrators, faculty and faculty sub-groups, regarding the recommended degree of faculty participation in decision-making.

DECISION-MAKING ITEMS	ALL RESPONDENTS		FACULTY		ADMINIS-TRATION		MALE FACULTY		FEMALE FACULTY		APPLIED FACULTY		ACADEMIC FACULTY		FACULTY WITH PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZA-TIONAL EXPER		FACULTY WITH OUT PROFES-SIONAL ORGA-NIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE		TENURED FA-CULTY 4 to 19 YEARS EXPER-IENCE		TENURED FA-CULTY WITH OVER 15 YEARS EXPERIENCE	
	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK
1. Selection of new fa-culty members (Hiring of new teachers)	3.59	12	3.71	11	3.40	14	3.73	11	3.68	13	3.47	13.5	3.89	11	3.67	13	3.88	8.5	3.77	11	3.43	17
2. Evaluation and reten-tion of probationary teachers	3.39	16	3.52	17	3.19	16	3.51	16	3.52	17	3.30	17	3.67	14.5	3.49	17	3.61	15.5	3.55	15	3.34	20
3. Evaluation of permanent faculty	3.25	21	3.32	21	3.14	17	3.29	21	3.39	19.5	3.11	21	3.46	20	3.28	21	3.44	19	3.34	20	3.13	21.5
4. Dismissal of tenured faculty	3.27	18	3.39	19	3.08	20	3.40	19	3.39	19.5	3.05	22	3.63	18.5	3.32	19.5	3.66	13	3.43	19	3.13	21.5
5. Curriculum offerings and course requirements	3.99	2	4.07	3	3.87	2	4.04	3	4.15	3	4.02	1	4.10	4	4.07	2	4.08	2	4.07	3	4.04	5
6. Student degree require-ments	3.79	7	3.85	7.5	3.71	5	3.85	6	3.84	8	3.78	4	3.90	10	3.83	8	3.91	5.5	3.80	7.5	3.95	7.5
7. Student admission, re-tention and dismissal standards	3.58	13	3.59	14	3.58	8	3.62	14	3.50	18	3.47	13.5	3.67	14.5	3.63	14	3.41	21	3.55	15	3.65	14

TABLE NO. D
CONTINUED

The mean score and rank for each item, for all respondents, administrators, faculty and faculty sub-groups, regarding the recommended degree of faculty participation in decision-making.

DECISION-MAKING ITEMS	ALL RESPONDENTS		FACULTY		ADMINIS- TRATION		MALE FACULTY		FEMALE FACULTY		APPLIED FACULTY		ACADEMIC FACULTY		FACULTY WITH PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZA- TIONAL EXPER- IENCE		FACULTY WITH- OUT PROFFES- SIONAL ORGA- NIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE		TENURED FA- CULTY 4 to 15 YEARS EXPERIENCE		TENURED FA- CULTY WITH OVER 15 YEARS EXPERIENCE	
	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK
16. Budget planning and allocation of institutional resources	3.63	10	3.70	12	3.52	11	3.68	12	3.76	11	3.67	9.5	3.73	13	3.68	11	3.80	12	3.65	12	3.91	9
17. Departmental and institutional facilities planning	3.51	15	3.58	15	3.41	13	3.60	15	3.54	16	3.50	12	3.64	17	3.57	15	3.63	14	3.55	15	3.69	13
18. Teaching load and class size	3.70	8.5	3.86	6	3.45	12	3.79	10	4.03	4.5	3.75	6.5	3.94	7	3.85	6	3.88	8.5	3.84	6	4.00	6
19. Teacher class and room assignment	3.58	14	3.80	10	3.23	15	3.80	9	3.82	9.5	3.67	9.5	3.91	9	3.78	10	3.88	8.5	3.80	9	3.78	10.5
20. Specify organization, duties and authority of department committees	3.93	3	4.02	4	3.78	3.5	3.96	4	4.17	2	3.77	5	4.20	3	4.03	4	4.00	4	4.01	4	4.13	3
21. Membership of department committees	4.11	1	4.12	1	4.09	1	4.10	2	4.19	1	3.82	3	4.33	1	4.14	1	4.05	3	4.11	2	4.30	1
22. Specify organization, duties and authority of college wide committees	3.70	8.5	3.81	9	3.53	10	3.81	8	3.82	9.5	3.55	11	4.00	6	3.80	9	3.86	11	3.79	10	3.95	7.5
23. Membership of college wide committees	3.81	6	3.94	5	3.61	6	3.95	5	3.92	6	3.74	8	4.07	5	3.94	5	3.91	5.5	3.90	5	4.17	2